

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 23, 2008 ("Office Action"), the claims were rejected as follows:

- Claims 1, 8-10, 24, 27, 28, 36, 42, and 45-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,203,679, issued to Acebo et al. et al. (hereinafter "Acebo et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,177,825, issued to Borders et al. (hereinafter "Borders et al.") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087366, to Collier et al. (hereinafter "Collier et al.").
- Claims 2-7, 11, 12, 34, 35, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082877, to Schiff et al. (hereinafter "Schiff et al.").
- Claims 13, 29, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,640, issued to Goheen (hereinafter "Goheen").
- Claims 14-17 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., Goheen, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,706, issued to Patel (hereafter "Patel").
- Claims 18, 19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., further in view of Patel.
- Claims 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., in further view of Goheen, and further in view of Patel.
- Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., in view of Patel and further in view of Schiff et al.

- Claims 37-41, 56-58, 60, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,926,203, issued to Sehr (hereinafter "Sehr").
- Claim 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., further in view of Sehr and further in view of Patel.
- Claims 52-53 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acebo et al. in view of Borders et al., Collier et al., further in view of Patel, Goheen, and further in view of Sehr.

For the following reasons, applicants respectfully submit that prior art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest reservation information characterized by:

a three-tiered hierarchical relationship defined by:

reservation transaction records including data associated with one or more reservation request;

reservation item records based on reservation transaction records and identifying a set of inventory items associated with the specific inventory request, wherein the reservation item records do not correspond to an instance of an inventory item; and

one or more reservation inventory records based on reservation item records and defining instance data associated with inventory items matched with the one or more reservation requests;

as recited in the claims of the present application

A. Summary of the Present Application

The present application generally relates to a system, method and computer-readable medium for processing reservation requests. Specifically, the present invention maps one or more reservation requests into reservation information matching inventory data associated with the reservation request. The reservation information is organized according to a three-tiered hierarchical relationship. At the first and topmost level of the hierarchical relationship are reservation transaction records that correspond to the reservation request itself. In the second level of the hierarchical relationship are one or more reservation item records that are associated with each reservation transaction records. The reservation item records correspond to an inventory transaction record and define information associated with inventory items that are

included in the reservation request. However, the inventory transaction records do not include the information about the specific inventory item that will be utilized to fulfill the transaction request. In the third level of the hierarchical relationship are one or more reservation items records which correspond to a reservation transaction records from the second level of the hierarchical relationship. The reservation item records correspond to instance of the actual inventory items that will be utilized to fulfill the reservation request.

As claimed, the present invention processes reservation requests for one or more inventory items utilizing the three-tiered reservation request data record.

B. Independent Claims 1, 27, and 50

As amended, independent Claims 1, 27 and 50 recite:

a three-tiered hierarchical relationship defined by:

reservation transaction records including data associated with one or more reservation request;

reservation item records based on reservation transaction records and identifying a set of inventory items associated with the specific inventory request, wherein the reservation item records do not correspond to an instance of an inventory item; and

one or more reservation inventory records based on reservation item records and defining instance data associated with inventory items matched with the one or more reservation requests

Claims 1 and 27 further recite:

wherein the reservation information corresponding to the matched inventory data includes:

a reservation transaction record corresponding to user request for reservation;

one or more reservation item records based on the reservation transaction record and the matched inventory data; and

one or more reservation inventory records corresponding to instance data of the matched inventory data

Similarly, Claim 50 recites:

wherein, for each of the multiple requests, the reservation information includes:

a reservation transaction record corresponding to user request for reservation;

one or more reservation item records based on the reservation transaction record and the matched inventory data; and

one or more reservation inventory records corresponding to instance data of the matched inventory data

Applicants agree with the Office Action that Acebo et al. fails to teach or suggest “three levels of detail organized into a hierarchical relationship” As conceded in the Office Action, Acebo et al. further fails to teach or suggest “processing the reservation transaction records, reservation items records, and reservation inventory records.” Applicants respectfully suggest that the additional cited art, Borders et al., Collier et al., Goheen, Schiff et al., Sehr, alone or in combination, fail to provide the known deficiencies in the teachings of Acebo et al..

Applicants respectfully submit that Borders et al. fails to disclose the recited three-tiered hierarchical structure recited in the claims. Although Borders et al. teaches a tiered hierarchical tree structure for managing product inventory, it fails to teach or disclose “instance data of the matched inventory” corresponding to the recited one or more inventor records. For example, according to the teachings of Borders et al., a 16-ounce Brand X potato chip bag corresponds to a SKU. While this reflects a type of chip, Borders et al. does not teach or suggest tracking each instance of the specified Brand X bag of potato chips a particular store may have in inventory. Such tracking would not be practical within the technical domain of the teachings of Borders et al. Applicants further submit that the remaining cited art, Collier et al., Goheen, Schiff et al., or Sehr, alone or in combination, do not overcome these deficiencies in the combined teachings of Acebo et al. and Borders et al..

Under Section 103, all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970). For the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that cited references, Acebo et al., Borders et al., Collier et al., Goheen, Sehr, and Schiff et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claims 1, 27, and 50. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 27, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of the claims.

C. Dependent Claims 2-24, 28-41, and 51-61

Claims 2-24 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 28-41 depend from independent Claim 27, and Claims 51-61 depend from independent Claim 50 and include all of the limitations of their respective base claims. For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to

independent Claims 1, 27, and 50, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-24, 28-41, and 51-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of the claims.

D. Independent Claim 64

Independent Claim 64 is based on former independent Claim 42. In a manner similar to independent Claims 1, 27, and 50, independent Claim 64 recites:

a data store for storing the reservation information, wherein the reservation information is organized in accordance with a three tiered hierarchical relationship defined by:

reservation transaction components including data associated with one or more reservation requests,

reservation items components corresponding to reservation transaction records and identifying a set of inventory items associated with the specific reservation request, and

one or more reservation inventory components corresponding to reservation items records and defining instance data associated with reservation requests for inventory items identified in the inventory reservation items records.

Claim 64 also recites:

wherein the reservation information includes:

a reservation transaction component corresponding to the user reservation request,

one or more reservation items components corresponding to inventory items identified in the matched inventory data, and

one or more reservation inventory components corresponding to instance data of the inventory items identified in the reservation inventory records.

As previously discussed, applicants agree with the Office Action that Acebo et al. fails to teach or disclose the recited three-tiered hierarchical relationship in Claim 64. Additionally, for the same reasons discussed above, the remaining prior art, Borders et al., Collier et al., Schiff et al., Schr, and Goheen, alone or in combination, fails to overcome the deficiencies in the teachings of Acebo et al.. Among other limitations, the cited art fails to teach or suggestion "one or more reservation inventory components corresponding to reservation items records and defining instance data associated with reservation requests for inventory items identified in the inventory reservation items records." For these reasons, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of the claim.

E. Dependent Claims 43-49

Dependent Claims 43-49 now depend from new independent Claim 64. For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claim 64, dependent Claims 43-49 are allowable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 43-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of the claims.

F. No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child, or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

G. Co-Pending Applications of Assignee

Applicants wish to draw the Examiner's attention to the following co-pending applications of the present application's assignee.

Docket No.	Serial No.	Title	Filed
EXIN.009A	09/932,441	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MANAGING INVENTORY	AUGUST 17, 2001

H. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorney such that the issues may be promptly resolved.

Application No.: 09/932,263
Filing Date: August 17, 2001

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 23, 2009

By: 

Mauricio A. Uribe
Registration No. 46,206
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(206) 405-2000

AMEND

6842295 tmm 031909